

REMARKS

Applicant previously elected the following species without traverse:

A naphthalene compound of Formula I where R2 and R4 are aryl and R1, R3, R5, and R6 are alkyl and with the ultimate species = Inv 2 at page 15;

A blue emitter of category (c) with ultimate species = B-6 at page 59;

A green emitter of category(a) with ultimate species = L30 at page 53.

The examiner has withdrawn the requirement for the blue and green emitters in this Office action. Claims 1, 6-8, and 13-52 appear to read upon the elected naphthalene species. Claims 2-5 and 9-12 are withdrawn as non-elected.

The terminal disclaimer filed on November 8, 2006 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application, which would extend beyond the expiration date of U.S. 6,967,062; 7,037,601; and 6,875,524 has been reviewed and is accepted and has been recorded.

The rejections of claims 15, 21, 25, 40, and 49-50 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in the last Office action (mailed September 15, 2006) have been withdrawn. The rejection of claims 1, 6, 7, 13-17, 21-37, 40-47, 49, and 52 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Hatwar et al. (US 6,967,062) have also been withdrawn. The double patenting rejections over U.S. Patent Nos. 6,967,062; 7,037,601; and 6,875,524 set forth in the last Office action are withdrawn due to the terminal disclaimer.

Claim 15 stands objected to because of the following informalities: The word "wheein" should be changed to "wherein". This typing error has been corrected in the amendment.

Claim 45 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 45 recites "the individual pixels"; however, pixels are not previously set forth or described. This

Claims 1, 6-8, 13-18, 24-33, 41, 42, 46, and 47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuura et al. (US 5,503,910)

in view of Sato et al. (JP 04-335087). Matsuura teaches organic light emitting devices having first and second emitting layers (see abstract). Matsuura teaches a bluish layer and a reddish/yellow layer (see col. 3, lines 11-19). There may be a layer with a hole transporting material and may emit in the 580nm to 650nm range per the “hole transporting layer” (see col. 3, lines 20-28). The reference teaches unsubstituted rubrene as a dopant (see col. 61, bottom compound).

The Examiner acknowledges that Matsuura fails to teach the rubrene species currently claimed. Sato teaches in analogous art naphthalene derivatives of formula (I) for an EL device, wherein R1-R4 may include alkyl or substituted aromatic hydrocarbon groups and R5 and R6 may include alkyl groups (see abstract). The Examiner acknowledges that Sato fails to specify an aryl group as a possible substituent group for the aromatic hydrocarbon group; however aryl groups are well known as substituents. The Examiner argues that the selection is obvious because one would expect the rubrene derivatives to be similar useful as a light emitting material for the Matsuura device.

Applicants believe that the comparative data in the application overcomes the basis for the Examiner’s rejection. The Examiner suggests that one of ordinary skill in the art would find it obvious to substitute the substituted rubrene of Sato for the unsubstituted rubrene of Matsuura.

Tables 1 and 2 at page 72 of the application compares the effect of unsubstituted rubrene (Matsuura and Comp-1) to inventive compounds Inv-1 and Inv-2. In each case the yield and efficiency is improved by 20% over the Matsuura compound and a 5% advantage over Comp-2. Moreover, Table 3 shows that Comp-2 exhibits a horrible thermal stability with no compound remaining at the end of the stability test. Tables 4 and 5 show the efficiency advantage of a co-doped yellow emission in the 30% neighborhood.

Neither Matsuura nor Sato suggests a specific yellow emitter of the invention in a hole transport layer and the comparative unsubstituted rubrene suggested by both is inferior.

Claims 1-17, 23, and 26 stand rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-35 of U.S. Patent No. 7,087,320. Claims 1-17, 23, and 26 stand rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-31 of U.S. Patent No. 7,052,785. Claims 1-17, 23, and 26 stand

rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-28 of U.S. Patent No. 7,083,865. Claims 1-23 and 26 stand provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-22, 27-29, and 31-36 of copending U. S. Serial No. 10/801,288. The enclosed Terminal Disclaimer is sufficient to overcome this rejection.

Claims 19-23, 34-40, 43-45, and 48-52 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. However, it is believed all rejections and objections have now been overcome and all the claims are allowable. It is further requested that the Examiner rejoin the non- elected species and allow all of the claims.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection and to pass the subject application to Allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'A. Kluegel', written over a horizontal line.

Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 25,518

Arthur E. Kluegel/dlm
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: 585-477-2625
Facsimile: 585-477-1148

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.

Encl: Terminal disclaimer over 3 Patent and 1 Application.